

A LONG EF-EQUIVALENCE NON ISOMORPHIC MODELS

SAHARON SHELAH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics
Hill Center-Busch Campus
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

ABSTRACT. There has been much interest on constructing models which are not isomorphic of cardinality λ but are equivalent under the Ehrenfeucht–Fraïssé game of length α even for every $\alpha < \lambda$. So under G.C.H. we know much. We deal here with constructions of such pairs of models proven in ZFC and get the existence under mild conditions.

The author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation. Publication 836.
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ - $\text{\texttt{TEX}}$

§0 INTRODUCTION

There has been much work on constructing pairs of $\text{EF}_{\alpha,\mu}$ -equivalent non-isomorphic models of the same cardinality.

In Summer of 2003, Vaananen has asked me whether we can provably in ZFC construct a pair of non-isomorphic models of cardinality $\aleph_1$ which are EF_α -equivalent even for α like ω^2 . We try here to shed light on the problem for general cardinals. We construct such models for $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ simultaneously. In subsequent works we shall investigate also for singular $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ and weaken the assumption “ $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ ” (e.g., $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \beth_\omega$) and we generalize the results for trees with no λ -branches.

0.1 Definition. 1) We say that M_1, M_2 are EF_α -equivalent if M_1, M_2 are models (with same vocabulary) such that the isomorphic player has a winning strategy in the game $\mathfrak{D}_1^\alpha(M_1, M_2)$ defined below.

1A) Replacing α by $< \alpha$ means: for every $\beta < \alpha$; similarly below.

2) We say that M_1, M_2 are $\text{EF}_{\alpha, < \mu}$ -equivalent when M_1, M_2 are models with the same vocabulary such that the isomorphism player has a winning strategy in the game $\mathfrak{D}_\mu^\alpha(M_1, M_2)$ defined below.

3) For M_1, M_2, α, μ as above and partial isomorphism f from M_1 into M_2 we define the game $\mathfrak{D}_\mu^\alpha(f, M_1, M_2)$ between the players ISO and AIS as follows:

- (a) the play lasts α moves
- (b) after β moves a partial isomorphism f_β from M_1 into M_2 is chosen increasing continuous with β
- (c) in the $\beta + 1$ -th move, the player AIS chooses $A_{\beta,1} \subseteq M_1, A_{\beta,2} \subseteq M_2$ such that $|A_{\beta,1}| + |A_{\beta,2}| < 1 + \mu$ and then the player ISO chooses $f_{\beta+1} \supseteq f_\beta$ such that $A_{\beta,1} \subseteq \text{Dom}(f_{\beta+1})$ and $A_{\beta,2} \subseteq \text{Rang}(f_{\beta+1})$
- (d) if $\beta = 0$, ISO chooses $f_0 = f$; if β is a limit ordinal ISO chooses $f_\beta = \cup\{f_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$.

The ISO player loses if he had no legal move.

4) If $f = \emptyset$ we may write $\mathfrak{D}_\mu^\alpha(M_1, M_2)$. If μ is 1 we may omit it. We may write $\leq \mu$ instead of μ^+ .

§1 THE CASE OF REGULAR $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$

1.1 Definition. 1) We say that $\mathfrak{x}$ is a λ -parameter if $\mathfrak{x}$ consists of

- (a) a cardinal λ and ordinal $\alpha^* \leq \lambda$
- (b) a set I , and a set $S \subseteq I \times I$ (where we shall have compatibility demand)
- (c) a function $\mathbf{u} : I \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$; we let $\mathbf{u}_s = \mathbf{u}(s)$
- (d) a set J and function $\mathbf{s} : J \rightarrow I$, we let $\mathbf{s}_t = \mathbf{s}(t)$ and for $s \in I$ we let $J_s = \{t \in J : \mathbf{s}_t = s\}$
- (e) a set $T \subseteq J \times J$ such that $(t_1, t_2) \in T \Rightarrow (\mathbf{s}_{t_1}, \mathbf{s}_{t_2}) \in S$

1A) We say $\mathfrak{x}$ is a full λ -parameter if in addition it consists of:

- (f) a function $\mathbf{g}$ with domain J such that $\mathbf{g}_t = \mathbf{g}(t)$ is a function from $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{s}(t)}$ to $\alpha_t < \alpha^*$
- (g) a function $\mathbf{h}$ with domain J such that $\mathbf{h}_t = \mathbf{h}(t)$ is a non-decreasing function from $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{s}(t)}$ to λ such that
- (h) if $t_1, t_2 \in J$ and $\mathbf{s}_{t_1} = s = \mathbf{s}_{t_2}$, $\mathbf{g}_{t_1} = g = \mathbf{g}_{t_2}$ and $\mathbf{h}_{t_1} = h = \mathbf{h}_{t_2}$ then $t_1 = t_2$ hence we write $t_\ell = t_{s,g,h} = t(s, g, h)$.

2) We may write $\alpha^* = \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*$, $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathfrak{x}}$, $I = I_{\mathfrak{x}}$, $t(s, g, h) = t^{\mathfrak{x}}(s, g, h)$, etc. Many times we omit $\mathfrak{x}$ when clear from the context.

1.2 Definition. Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a λ -parameter.

- 1) Let $\mathbb{G}_{\mathfrak{x}}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ be the group¹ generated freely by $\{x_t : t \in J_{\mathfrak{x}}\}$.
- 2) For $(s_1, s_2) \in S_{\mathfrak{x}}$ let $\mathbb{G}_{s_1, s_2}^{\mathfrak{x}} = G_{s_1, s_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ be the subgroup of $\mathbb{G}_{s_1}^{\mathfrak{x}} \times \mathbb{G}_{s_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ generated by

$$\{(x_{t_1}, x_{t_2}) : (t_1, t_2) \in T_{\mathfrak{x}}\}$$

- 3) We say $\mathfrak{x}$ is (λ, θ) -parameter if $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}} \Rightarrow |\mathbf{u}_s| < \theta$.

1.3 Remark. 1) We may use S a set of n -tuples from I (or $(< \omega)$ -tuples) then we have to change Definitions 1.2, 1.4 accordingly.

¹we also could use abelian groups satisfying $\forall x(x + x = 0)$, in this case $\mathbb{G}_s$ is the family of finite subsets of J_s with the symmetric difference operation

1.4 Definition. For a λ -parameter $\mathfrak{x}$ we define a model $M_{\mathfrak{x}}$ as follows (where below $I = I_{\mathfrak{x}}$, etc.).

- (A) its vocabulary τ consist of
 - (α) P_s , a unary predicate, for $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}$
 - (β) Q_{s_1, s_2} a binary predicate for $(s_1, s_2) \in S^{\mathfrak{x}}$
 - (γ) $F_{s, a}$ a unary function for $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}, a \in \mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}$
- (B) the universe of M is $\{(s, x) : s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}, x \in \mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}\}$
- (C) for $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ let $P_s^M = \{(s, x) : x \in \mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}\}$
- (D) $Q_{s_1, s_2}^M = \{(s_1, x_1), (s_2, x_2) : (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{G}_{s_1, s_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}\}$ for $(s_1, s_2) \in S_{\mathfrak{x}}$
- (E) if $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $a \in \mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}$ then $F_{s, a}^M$ is the unary function from P_s^M to P_s^M defined by $F_{s, a}^M(y) = ay$, multiplication in $\mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}$ (for $y \in M \setminus P_s^M$ we can let $F_{s, a}^M(y)$ be y or undefined).

1.5 Definition. 1) For $\mathfrak{x}$ a λ -parameter and for $I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ let $M_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}} = M_{\mathfrak{x}} \upharpoonright \cup \{P^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}} : s \in I'\}$ and let $I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{x}} = I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{x}} = \{s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}} : \mathbf{u}_s < \gamma\}$.

2) Assume $\mathfrak{x}$ is a full λ -parameter and $\beta < \lambda$; we let $\alpha < \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*$ and let $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ be the set of $g : \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ which are non-decreasing; then for $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\mathfrak{x}}$

- (a) we define $h = h_g : \beta \rightarrow \lambda$ as follows: $h(\gamma) = \text{Min}\{\beta' \leq \beta : \text{if } \beta' < \beta \text{ then } g(\beta') > g(\gamma)\}$
- (b) we let $I_g = I_g^{\mathfrak{x}} = \{s \in I : \mathbf{u}_s \subseteq \beta \text{ and } t_{s, g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s, h_g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s} \text{ is well defined}\}$
- (c) we define $\bar{c}_g = \langle c_{g, s} : s \in I_g^{\mathfrak{x}} \rangle$ by $c_{g, s} = x_{t_{g, s}}$ where $t_{g, s} = t_{s, g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s, h_g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s}^{\mathfrak{x}}$.

3) Let $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{x}} = \cup \{\mathcal{G}_{\alpha, \beta}^{\mathfrak{x}} : \beta < \lambda\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{x}} = \cup \{\mathcal{G}_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{x}} : \alpha < \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*\}$.

1.6 Definition. Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a λ -parameter.

1) Let $\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{x}} = \cup \{\mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}} : I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}\}$ where for $I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ we let $\mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}} = \{\bar{c} : \bar{c} = \langle c_s : s \in I' \rangle \text{ satisfies } c_s \in \mathbb{G}_s^{\mathfrak{x}} \text{ when } s \in I' \text{ and } (c_{s_1}, c_{s_2}) \in \mathbb{G}_{s_1, s_2}^{\mathfrak{x}} \text{ when } (s_1, s_2) \in S^{\mathfrak{x}} \text{ and } s_1, s_2 \in I'\}$.

2) For $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}, I' \subseteq I^{\mathfrak{x}}$, let $f_{\bar{c}}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ be the partial function from $M_{\mathfrak{x}}$ into itself defined by $f_{\bar{c}}^{\mathfrak{x}}((s, y)) = (s, yc_s)$ for $(s, y) \in P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}, s \in I'$.

3) $M_{\mathfrak{x}}$ is P_s -rigid when for every automorphism f of $M_{\mathfrak{x}}, f \upharpoonright P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is the identity.

1.7 Observation. Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a λ -parameter. If $g : \gamma_2 \rightarrow \alpha < \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*$ is non-decreasing, $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ and $(\forall \gamma < \gamma_1)(g(\gamma) < g(\gamma_1))$ then $I_{g \upharpoonright \gamma_1} \subseteq I_g$ and $h_{g \upharpoonright \gamma_1} \subseteq h_g$ and $\bar{c}_{g \upharpoonright \gamma_1} = \bar{c}_g \upharpoonright I_{g \upharpoonright \gamma_1}$.

1.8 Claim. Assume $\mathfrak{x}$ is a full λ -parameter.

- 1) For $I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$, $f_{\bar{c}}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is an automorphism of $M_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$, which is the identity iff $s \in I' \Rightarrow c_s = e_{\mathbb{G}_s}$. Also for $s \in I'$, $f_{\bar{c}}^{\mathfrak{x}} \upharpoonright P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is not the identity iff $c_s \neq e_{\mathbb{G}_s}$.
- 2) If $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{x}}$ in Definition 1.5, then $\bar{c}_g \in \mathbf{C}_{I_g}^{\mathfrak{x}}$.
- 3) If f is an automorphism of $M_{I_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ then $f \upharpoonright M_{I_1}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is an automorphism of $M_{I_1}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ for every $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$.
- 4) If $I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and f is an automorphism of $M_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$, then $f = f_{\bar{c}}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ for some $\langle c_s : s \in I' \rangle \in \mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$.
- 5) If $\bar{c}_{\ell} \in \mathbf{C}_{I_{\ell}}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $I_1 \subseteq I_2$ and $\bar{c}_1 = \bar{c}_2 \upharpoonright I_1$ then $f_{\bar{c}_1} \subseteq f_{\bar{c}_2}$.

Proof. Straight, e.g.

- 4) For $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ clearly $f((s, e_{\mathbb{G}_s})) \in P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ so it has the form (s, c_s) , $c_s \in \mathbb{G}_s$ and let $\bar{c} = \langle c_s : s \in I' \rangle$. To check that $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$, assume $(s_1, s_2) \in S_{\mathfrak{x}}$; and we have to check that $(c_{s_1}, c_{s_2}) \in \mathbb{G}_{s_1, s_2}$. This holds as $((s_1, e_{\mathbb{G}_{s_1}}), (s_2, e_{\mathbb{G}_{s_2}})) \in Q_{s_1, s_2}^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ by the choice of $Q_{s_1, s_2}^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ hence we have $((s_1, c_{s_1}), (s_2, c_{s_2})) = (f(s_1, e_{\mathbb{G}_{s_1}}), f(s_2, e_{\mathbb{G}_{s_2}})) \in Q_{s_1, s_2}^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ hence $(c_{s_1}, c_{s_2}) \in \mathbb{G}_{s_1, s_2}$. $\square_{1.8}$

1.9 Claim. Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a full λ -parameter. A sufficient condition for “ $(M_{\mathfrak{x}}, c_1), (M_{\mathfrak{x}}, c_2)$ are $\text{EF}_{\alpha, \mu}$ -equivalent” is the existence of $R, \bar{I}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}$ such that:

- ⊗ (a) R is a partial order,
- (b) $\bar{I} = \langle I_r : r \in R \rangle$ such that $I_r \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $r_2 \leq_R r_1 \Rightarrow I_{r_1} \subseteq I_{r_2}$
- (c) R is the disjoint union of $\langle R_{\beta} : \beta < \alpha \rangle$, $R_0 \neq \emptyset$
- (d) $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \langle \bar{c}^r : r \in R \rangle$ where $\bar{c}^r \in \mathbf{C}_{I_r}$ and $r_1 \leq r_2 = \bar{c}^{r_1} = \bar{c}^{r_2} \upharpoonright I_{r_1}$
- (e) if $\langle r_{\beta} : \beta < \beta^* \rangle$ is $\leq_R$ -increasing, $\beta < \beta^* \Rightarrow r_{\beta} \in R_{\beta}$ and $\beta^* < \alpha$ then it has an $\leq_R$ -ub from R_{β^*}
- (f) if $r_1 \in R_{\beta}$, $\beta + 1 < \alpha$ and $I' \subseteq I$, $|I'| < \mu$ then
 $(\exists r_2)(r_1 \leq r_2 \in R_{\beta+1} \wedge I' \subseteq I_{r_2})$.

Proof. Easy. Using 1.8(1),(5). $\square_{1.9}$

1.10 Claim. 1) Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a λ -parameter and $I' \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{x}}$. A necessary and sufficient condition for “ $M_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is P_s -rigid” is:

- ⊗₁ there is no $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{C}_{I'}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ with $c_s \neq e_{\mathbb{G}_s}$.

2) Let $\mathfrak{x}$ be a full λ -parameter and assume that $s(*) \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}, \alpha < \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*, \alpha \geq \omega$ for notational simplicity and $t^* \in J_{s(*)}^{\mathfrak{x}}$. The models $M_1 = (M, (s, e_{\mathbb{G}_s}))$, $M_2 = (M, (e, x_{t^*}))$ are $\text{EF}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ -equivalent when:

- $\otimes_{2, \alpha}$ (i) λ is regular, $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}} \Rightarrow |\mathbf{u}_s^{\mathfrak{x}}| < \lambda$
- (ii) if $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{x}}$ and $\mathbf{u}_s^{\mathfrak{x}} \subseteq \text{Dom}(g)$ then $t_{s, g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s, h_g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ is well defined
- (iii) if $(s_1, s_2) \in S$ and $t_1 = t_{s_1, g_1, h_1}, t_2 = t_{s_2, g_2, h_2}$ are well defined then $(t_1, t_2) \in T^{\mathfrak{x}}$ when for some $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{x}}$ we have $g_{t_1} \cup g_{t_2} \subseteq g$ and $h_1 \cup h_2 \subseteq h_g$
- (iv) $t^* = t_{s(*)^*, g, h_g}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ where $g : \mathbf{u}_{s(*)} \rightarrow \{0\}$ and h_g is constantly $\gamma^* = \cup\{\gamma + 1 : \gamma \in \mathbf{u}_{s(*)}\}$.

Proof. 1) Toward contradiction assume that f is an automorphism of $M_I^{\mathfrak{x}}$, such that $f \upharpoonright P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is not the identity. By 1.8(4) for some $\bar{c} \in \mathbf{C}_I^{\mathfrak{x}}$, we have $f = f_{\bar{c}}$. So $f_{\bar{c}} \upharpoonright P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}} = f \upharpoonright P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}} \neq \text{id}$ hence by 1.8(1) we have $c_s \neq e_{\mathbb{G}_s}$, contradicting the assumption $\otimes_1$.

2) We apply 1.9. For every $i < \alpha$ and non-decreasing function $g \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{x}}$ from some ordinal $\gamma = \gamma_g$ onto i we define $\bar{c}_g = \langle c_{g,s} : s \in I_{g_p} \rangle, c_{g,s} = (s, x_{t_{g,s}}), t_{g,s} = t_{s, g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s, h_g \upharpoonright \mathbf{u}_s}$. Let $R_i = \{g : g \text{ a non-decreasing function from some } \gamma < \lambda \text{ to } i \text{ such that } \gamma^* \leq \gamma, g \upharpoonright \gamma^* \text{ is constantly zero, } \gamma^* < \gamma \Rightarrow g(\gamma^*) = 1\}$ and let $R = \cup\{R_i : i < \alpha\}$ ordered by inclusion. Let $I = \langle I_g : g \in R \rangle$ and $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \langle \bar{c}_g : g \in R \rangle$. It is easy to check that $(R, \bar{I}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$ is as required. $\square_{1.10}$

1.11 Claim. 1) Assume $\alpha^* \leq \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$. Then for some full $(\lambda, \aleph_1)$ -parameter $\mathfrak{x}$ we have $\alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^* = \alpha^*$ and condition $\otimes_1$ of 1.10(1) holds and for every $s(*) \in I \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ condition $\otimes_{2, \alpha}$ of 1.10(2) holds whenever $\alpha < \alpha^*$.

2) Moreover, if $s \in I_{\mathfrak{x}}^*$ then for some $c_1 \neq c_2 \in P_s^{M_{\mathfrak{x}}}$ and $(M, c_1), (M, c_2)$ are $\text{EF}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ -equivalent for every $\alpha < \alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*$ but not $\text{EF}_{\alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^*, \lambda}$ -equivalent.

This clearly implies

1.12 Conclusion. 1) If $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda^{\aleph_0}, \alpha^* \leq \lambda$ then for some model M of cardinality λ we have:

- (a) M has no non-trivial automorphism
- (b) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ for some $c_1 \neq c_2 \in M$, the model $(M, c_1), (M, c_2)$ are EF_{α} -equivalent and even $\text{EF}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ -equivalent.

2) We can strengthen clause (b) to: for some $c_1 \neq c_2$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ the models $(M, c_1), (M, c_2)$ are $\text{EF}_{\alpha,*}$ -equivalent.

Proof of 1.11. 1) Assume $\alpha_* > \omega$ for notational simplicity. We define $\mathfrak{x}$ by $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{x}} = \lambda$ and):

- $\boxtimes(a)$ (α) $I = \{u : u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \aleph_0}\}$
- (β) the function $\mathbf{u}$ is the identity on I
- (γ) $S = I \times I$
- (δ) $\alpha_{\mathfrak{x}}^* = \alpha^*$
- (b) (α) $J = \{(u, \alpha, g, h) : \text{this quadruple satisfies}$
 - (i) $u \in I, \alpha < \alpha^*$
 - (ii) h is a non-decreasing function from u to λ
 - (iii) g is a non-decreasing function from u to α
 - (iv) if $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in u$ and $g(\beta_1) = g(\beta_2)$ then $h(\beta_1) = h(\beta_2)$
 - (v) $h(\beta) > \beta\}$
- (β) so let $t = (u^t, \alpha^t, g^t, h^t)$ for $t \in J$ so naturally $\mathbf{s}_t = u$,
 $\mathbf{g}_t = g^t, \mathbf{h}_t = h^t$
- (γ) $T = \{(t_1, t_2) \in J \times J : \alpha^{t_1} = \alpha^{t_2}, u^{t_1} \subseteq u^{t_2}, h^{t_1} \subseteq h^{t_2} \text{ and } g^{t_1} \subseteq g^{t_2}\}.$

Now

- $(*)_0$ $\mathfrak{x}$ is a full $(\lambda, \aleph_1)$ -parameter
 [Why? Just read Definition 1.1 and 1.2(3).]
- $(*)_1$ for any $s(*) \in I \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, $\mathfrak{x}$ satisfies the demands for $\otimes_{2,\alpha}(i), (ii), (iii), (iv)$ from 1.10(2) for every $\alpha < \alpha^*$
 [why? just check]
- $(*)_2$ if $u_1 \subseteq u_2 \in I$, we define the function $\pi_{u_1, u_2} : J_{u_2} \rightarrow J_{u_1}$ by $F_{u_1, u_2}(t) = (u_1, \alpha^t, g^t \upharpoonright u_1, h^t \upharpoonright u_1)$ for $t \in J_{u_2}$, then
- $(*)_3$ for $u_1 \subseteq u_2$ we have
 - (α) $T \cap (J_{u_1} \times J_{u_2}) = \{(\pi_{u_1, u_2}(t_2), t_2) : t_2 \in J_{u_2}\}$ hence
 - (β) $\mathbb{G}_{u_1, u_2} = \{(\hat{\pi}_{u_1, u_2}(c_2), c_2) : c_2 \in \mathbb{G}_{u_2}\}$ where $\hat{\pi}_{u_1, u_2} \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_{u_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}, \mathbb{G}_{u_1}^{\mathfrak{x}})$ is the unique homomorphism from $\mathbb{G}_{u_2}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ into $\mathbb{G}_{u_1}^{\mathfrak{x}}$ mapping x_{t_2} to x_{t_1} whenever $\pi_{u_1, u_2}(t_2) = t_1$
 [Why? Check.]

- (*)₄ if $u_1 \cup u_2 \subseteq u_3 \in I$, $t_3 \in J_{u_3}$ and $t_\ell = \pi_{u_\ell, u_3}(t_3)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $\mathbf{g}_{t_1}, \mathbf{g}_{t_2}$ are compatible functions as well as $\mathbf{h}_{t_1}, \mathbf{h}_{t_2}$ and $\alpha^{t_1} = \alpha^{t_2}$ moreover $\mathbf{g}_{t_1} \cup \mathbf{g}_{t_2}$ is non-decreasing, $\mathbf{h}_{t_1} \cup \mathbf{h}_{t_2}$ is non-decreasing
- (*)₅ clause $\otimes_1$ of 1.10(1) holds for $I' = I$

[Why? Assume $\bar{c} \in C_I^\mathfrak{x}$ is such that $c_{s_*} \neq e_{\mathbb{G}_s}$. For each $u \in I$, c_s is a word in the generators $\{x_t : t \in J_u\}$ of $\mathbb{G}_u$ and let $\mathbf{n}(u)$ be the length of this word.

Now by (*)₃ we have $u_1 \subseteq u_2 \Rightarrow \mathbf{n}(u_1) \leq \mathbf{n}(u_2)$. As $(I, \subseteq)$ is $\aleph_1$ -directed, for some $u_* \in I$ we have $u_* \subseteq u \in I \Rightarrow \mathbf{n}(u) = n_*$ and let $c_u = (\dots x_{t(u, \ell)}^{i(\ell)} \dots)_{\ell < n_*}$ where $i(\ell) \in \{1, -1\}$ and $t(u, \ell) \in J_u^\mathfrak{x}$ and $t(u, \ell) = t(u, \ell + 1) \Rightarrow i(\ell) = i(\ell + 1)$. Clearly $u_* \subseteq u_1 \subseteq u_2 \in I$ & $\ell < n_* \Rightarrow F_{u_1, u_2}(t(u_2, \ell)) = t(u_1, \ell)$. By our assumption toward contradiction necessarily $n_* > 0$.

As $\{u : u_* \subseteq u \in I\}$ is directed, by (*)₄ above, for each $\ell < n_*$ any two of the functions $\{g^{t(u, \ell)} : u_* \subseteq u \in I\}$ are compatible so $g_\ell =: \cup \{g^{t(u, \ell)} : u \in I\}$ is a non-decreasing function from $\lambda = \cup \{u : u \in I\}$ to α^* and $h_\ell =: \cup \{h^{t(u, \ell)} : u_* \subseteq u \in I\}$ is similarly a non-decreasing function from λ to λ . It also follows that for some α_ℓ^* we have $\alpha_\ell^* =: \alpha^{t(u, \ell)}$ whenever $u_* \subseteq u \in I$. For each $i \in \text{Rang}(g_\ell) \subseteq \alpha_\ell^*$ choose $\beta_{\ell, i} < \lambda$ such that $g_\ell(\beta_{\ell, i}) = i$ and let $E = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ a limit ordinal} > \sup(u_*) \text{ such that } i < \alpha_\ell^* \text{ \& } \delta \Rightarrow \beta_{\ell, i} < \delta \text{ and } \beta < \delta \Rightarrow h_\ell(\beta) < \delta\}$, it is a club of λ . Choose u such that $u_* \subseteq u$ and $\text{Min}(u \setminus u_*) = \delta^* \in E$.

Now what can $\mathbf{g}_{t(u, \ell)}(\text{Min}(u \setminus u_*))$ be?

It has to be i for some $i < \alpha_\ell^* < \alpha^*$ hence $i \in \text{Rang}(g_\ell)$ so for some $u_1, u_* \subseteq u_1 \subseteq \delta^*$ and $\beta_{\ell, i} \in u_1$ so $h_\ell(\beta_{\ell, i}) < \delta^*$ hence considering $u \cup u_1$ and recalling clause $(\alpha)(vi)$ of (b) from definition of $\mathfrak{x}$ in the beginning of the proof we have $h_\ell(\beta_{\ell, i}) < h_\ell(\delta^*)$ hence by (clause (b)(α)(v)) we have $i = g_\ell(\beta_{\ell, i}) < g_\ell(\delta^*)$, contradiction.]

2) A minor change is needed in the choice of $T^\mathfrak{x}$

$$T^\mathfrak{x} = \{(t_1, t_2) : (t_1, t_2) \in J \times J \text{ and } u^{t_1} \subseteq u^{t_2}, h^{t_1} \subseteq h^{t_2}, g^{t_1} \subseteq g^{t_2}, \\ \gamma^{t_1} \leq \gamma^{t_2} \text{ and if } \text{Rang}(g^{t_1}) \not\subseteq \{0\} \text{ then } \alpha^{t_1} = \alpha^{t_2}\}.$$

□_{1.11}